

8. (Amended) A container for the disposal of food wastes, the container comprising:
  - (a) liquid impervious walls defining an opening for receiving the food wastes, the walls having an inner and outer surface;
  - (b) an absorbent material positioned adjacent the inner surface of the liquid impervious walls and having an effective amount of an odor-neutralizing composition deposited thereon, the odor-neutralizing compound comprising cyclodextrin; and
  - (c) a liquid pervious liner positioned adjacent to the absorbent material.
9. (Twice amended) A container according to claim 8 wherein the odor-neutralizing composition further comprises an antimicrobial agent.
10. (Twice amended) A container according to claim 8 wherein the odor-neutralizing composition further comprises a chelant.

---

REMARKS

The invention comprises a container having a liquid impervious shell, an absorbent material within the liquid impervious shell, and an odor-neutralizing composition. The odor-neutralizing composition comprises cyclodextrin. The odor-neutralizing composition optionally comprises an ingredient selected from the group consisting of chelants, antimicrobial agents, activated charcoal, baking soda, absorbent gelling material, zeolite, silica and mixtures thereof.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation that the odor-neutralizing composition of the invention comprise cyclodextrin. This limitation is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

35 USC §102 Rejection:

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Gunnell (US 1,724,579). Gunnell teaches the use of an antiseptic composition. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the odor-neutralizing composition of the invention comprise cyclodextrin. The Gunnell reference does not teach or suggest the use of cyclodextrin in an odor-neutralizing composition. Cyclodextrin is not considered an antiseptic material, therefore the reference does not anticipate the claims as amended.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8, and 9 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Caggiano (US 4,861,632). Caggiano does not teach or suggest the use of cyclodextrin in an odor-neutralizing composition. Caggiano does not anticipate the amended claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 8, and 9 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Kannakeril (US 4,927,010). Kannakeril does not teach or suggest the use of cyclodextrin in an odor-neutralizing composition, therefore, Kannakeril does not anticipate the amended claims.